New York Tribune

First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements.

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 2, 1916.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation. Ogden Reid, President; G. Vernor Rogers, Vice-President; Richard H. Waldo, Secretary; F. A. Suter, Treasurer. Address, Tribune Building, 154 Nassau Street, New York. Telephone, Beekman 3000.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York.

Daily & Sunday, 1 mo.	$ .75	Daily only, 1 month	$ .50
Daily & Sunday, 6 mos.	4.25	Daily only, 6 months	3.00
Daily & Sunday, 1 year	8.50	Daily only, 1 year	6.00
Sunday only, 6 months	1.25	Sunday only, 1 year	2.50

FOREIGN RATES. DAILY AND SUNDAY.		CANADIAN RATES. DAILY AND SUNDAY.	
One month	$1.84	One month	$ .75
One year	22.05	One year	8.50
SUNDAY ONLY.		DAILY ONLY.	
Six months	3.33	One month	.50
One year	6.66	One year	6.00
DAILY ONLY.		SUNDAY ONLY.	
One month	1.29	One month	.50
One year	15.23	One year	4.58

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

England and France.

War fills so much of the horizon while it is going forward that there is always a temptation to set down as permanent things which are transitory and dependent upon the conditions and emotions growing out of conflict. This is particularly true of the hatreds that grow out of strife; it is only less true of alliances, and there is sound reason for refraining from attaching too much importance to alliances which are made during the war.

And yet, having said this, it remains true that no more surprising, no more interesting, and certainly no more hopeful sign can be found in the whole history of the present conflict than the slow, steady, but ever growing friendship between France and Britain, conditioned upon a growing understanding between two peoples who over centuries have either misunderstood each other or too well understood the less attractive sides of their neighbor.

Now more than all else the progress of the war has taught Britain the true France—the France that always existed. Nothing is more preposterous than the notion that the France of to-day is different from the France of yesterday. But what millions of Englishmen have seen is the true France that escapes the mere traveller and for the mass of the people of England as of America France was just a geographical expression.

And no one can read the British press, the letters of the soldiers in the trenches, the comments of military critics and the simplest of civilians without feeling that there has come home to the whole British people a newer and truer appreciation of a great people long their enemies and only recently their allies.

Over and over again, sometimes a little naïvely, sometimes crudely, but with unmistakable sincerity and conviction, there is spread out in the testimony of British soldiers an unmeasured admiration for the men and women of France, for the courage, the devotion, the steadfastness of the French living in the midst of their ruins, in the presence of their dead, on the very edge of that abyss which yawns beyond the firing line.

Conversely the understanding of the British by the French has marched forward a little more slowly. The awful doubt of the days when Britain seemed irresolute, when the war had come, this remained in the French mind for months. Small wonder, too, that for days, weeks and months France waited anxiously, a little despairingly, for Britain to be ready.

Yet, with it all, with the doubts, the disappointments, the delays, no one who knows France can fail to recognize that appreciation of British purpose, British loyalty, above all, British good faith, has increased with every succeeding month of the war. No one can mistake the fact that to-day, when Britain is at last beginning to lift a portion of the terrible burden of the war off French soldiers, there is a final and a just appraisal of Britain from the Pyrenees to the German firing line.

In nothing has German intrigue been less successful than in the effort to foment trouble between the two Allies. The attack upon Verdun was beyond all else an attempt to convince France that Britain was not ready to help her and never would be, that France must surrender or die.

French military authorities measured this threat and they appraised French spirit accurately. There is nothing in the whole war finer than the French and British course in the Verdun crisis. Actually the British were still unready, but Sir Douglas Haig promptly offered to begin. Joffre declined to let him. He chose to have France "carry on," terrible as was the cost, until the British were ready.

Always, too, in the later months of the war the British have frankly and without question conformed to the will of the French military commanders. Britain has sent hundreds of thousands of men to France and in effect turned them over to the orders of Joffre. His will has prevailed. Even in the matter of Salonica Kitchener bowed to Joffre and British troops followed the French to the Balkans.

After all, the amazing thing about the Anglo-French alliance is not that it has not always worked perfectly, but that it has worked at all, that it has worked with ever increasing efficiency, and that out of the fusion of these people, so different in their race history and in their traditions, there has grown a mutual confidence and respect which it is not too much to say will remain a potent influence in European history for many decades at least.

The growth of Anglo-French confidence has quite baffled the German. From the outset his higher policy has been directed at estranging two enemies that he might destroy them separately. To-day he still warns Frenchmen that the British mean to hold Calais permanently, and in the same breath he whispers to the British that they have only to sacrifice France and the peace that they desire is within their grasp.

And to such appeals Frenchmen and Britons remain equally deaf. It is something more than a marriage of convenience, this Anglo-French alliance, and it is steadily taking on a better and more enduring character. The British soldier was the first to know the real France. He became at one time a missionary at home and a true representative in France. Against the common enemy—and the enemy of the things that France and Britain loved and served in common—the alliance took definite form.

It is a fact of more than passing importance that the two great democratic nations of Europe, nations with widely different ideals of democracy, but with a wide area of common ground, should thus be united by bonds which will endure beyond the war and influence human history for long years to come. In this alliance there exists a real and a sufficient counterpoise to that German peril which has threatened all democracy, ours as well as European.

As we enter the third year of the Great War there are grounds for confidence and for hope that did not exist one year ago, could not be dreamed of two years ago. Already the worst dangers are passed. It is no longer a question of how much of all we love and hold to Germany can destroy—the German horde is no longer on the advance. The problem remains to rescue from the hold of the beast that which he seized in his first mad foray. It is no longer a question of saving France; what remains is the task of rescuing Belgium, of restoring Serbia; above all, of having done with the German effort to destroy all else in this world to the greater glory of Teutonic Kultur.

And the weight of this task in Western Europe must fall upon the British. The French share has been more than performed. Still, in proportion to her resources France is going forward; but a willing Britain must bear the brunt of the battle which will establish the victory already half won and insure the safety of our civilization and our democracy.

It is easy to perceive that with the performance of this task, with the making of this sacrifice, a final basis of regard and respect will be reached between the two great liberal powers, and the alliance between France and Britain will be cemented by the blood of their sons, shed in a common cause.

There is no greater fact in the opening days of the third year of the conflict than this Anglo-French relation, now firmly established beyond even the reach of German intrigue. It is alike the assurance of coming victory and the guarantee of the endurance of the things which many of us care most for in life.

Suffrage for All.

Mr. Hughes's advocacy of a woman suffrage amendment to the Federal Constitution proves him a thoroughgoing believer in equal suffrage. Holding, as he does, the view that "opposition may delay, but cannot defeat, this movement," and that delay will produce "a struggle increasing in bitterness, which I believe to be inimical to our welfare," he supports the course which promises to end that struggle soonest by giving to women in all the states the advantages and protection of the ballot.

This is advanced ground—a position ahead of the candidate's party platform, and even beyond that taken by many suffragists, who have been willing to continue the fight state by state. Nevertheless, there will be few who sorrow because Mr. Hughes has seen the desirability of settling the question "for the entire country." The present situation is anomalous, illogical. Women of California are no better qualified to vote than their sisters of New York and New Jersey and Pennsylvania, where the male voters, having a monopoly of the privilege, decided to retain the monopoly. Submission of a Federal suffrage amendment would offer opportunity to remove the existing inequality which the voting women of the West, now unable to use their votes in aid of their sex seeking votes in other states, save by entering on a long campaign of head-hunting, would welcome gladly.

Woman suffrage must come, and it will come, sooner or later, for every state in the land. Women need the ballot; they want it; they are entitled to whatever help it gives in meeting the difficulties of life. It is silly to argue, as do some of the anti-suffragists, that a defeat of the movement in any state means anything but a temporary setback to be followed by a renewal of the fight from the beginning. Mr. Hughes wisely recognizes all this, and proposes, not only the submission, but the ratification, of the Federal amendment to end the long and wasteful fight. His is a strong and logical advocacy of the women's cause. They could gain no more powerful recruit.

The Worst in the World.

Perhaps that is an ungrateful accusation at a moment when the weather has suddenly reformed and given us again a few livable hours. But let us not be good-natured to our own destruction. Had it not been for our short American memories and easygoing optimism we should long since have Done Something about the weather. As it is, we fume and melt and imprecate while the hot blasts are stuffed down our throats—and promptly burst forth into smiles and praise at the first return of freshness.

What we are urging is a little persistent ill temper toward our weather. We all know it is the worst in the world. Whether our guests arrive from Chicago or Naples or Singapore, they all make the same accusation. Not so hot in degrees of Fahrenheit, yes. But at home it is so dry that you don't feel the heat at all. We suppose there was a time when New Yorkers were offended by such charges. They protested and fibbed about sleeping under blankets just like the residents of any other summer resort. That has ended. The truth was at some point so driven in and established that it could not be denied. Then occurred the evil change. Instead of struggling on and protesting we accepted our fate with resignation. We grew almost complacent about our abominable weather and fairly revelled in our thick, sticky discomfort. "It isn't the heat," etc., became our proudest municipal boast.

It is too late to change the weather. It is never too late to change our habits so as to avoid its worst effects. Tropic food, tropic clothes and a rearrangement of work hours so as to provide noon *siestas* would make life in New York really endurable. But first of all we must end our relish of martyrdom and cultivate a perpetual grouch against our worst of all lots. Properly enraged, we might in the end achieve something approximating comfort.

More Air Raids on England.

At least six airships, and possibly seven, took part in the latest raid on England, yet the damage done was comparatively slight. No one was killed or even hurt, which is remarkable, considering the strength of the attacking force. Moreover, if the official report is to be credited, nothing of military value was achieved.

This is the third air raid in the space of a week, and in point of numbers the most formidable hitherto recorded. It is not unlikely that we shall hear of a succession of similar attacks if the weather continues to be favorable. A long period of quiescence followed the loss of a Zeppelin three months ago, but it was never believed either that a successful method of defence had been devised or that the Germans had abandoned this method of warfare as futile. There is no way of determining from the very vague reports given out in England what they were aiming at on this occasion. It is possible that they had some definite end in view beyond the mere terrorizing of the inhabitants. Doubtless in a day or two an elaborate report of what was supposed to be accomplished will come from Berlin, but for obvious reasons all such reports are untrustworthy, being in the main conjectural and often demonstrably fanciful and extravagant.

There is little reason to believe that London was visited this time. Perhaps the air defences have been strengthened sufficiently to assure its protection; it is not unlikely, however, that the raiders aimed at some other object. As one report says that many of the bombs fell into the sea, the attack was possibly directed mainly against shipping. According to the official announcement, one raider under the fire of the anti-aircraft guns "was seen to drop to a low altitude." That is the only indication of a possible hit, and it is very vague and doubtful. The chances of hitting Zeppelins from stationary batteries are generally slight, and though British guns brought down two in the first week of May there is little ground for confidence in this means of defence under most conditions. The latest airships, being at least fifteen metres long, present a fairly large target, yet when visibility is low or when the ships are sailing at a great height—say, 3,000 metres—it is but rarely that a hit can be scored. No trustworthy defence against air raids has as yet been found.

The Army and Newspapers.

(From The Army and Navy Journal.)

Secretary Baker has adopted rules and regulations concerning correspondents in the field. Each correspondent, in order to obtain permission to go with the army, must deposit a certified check of $1,000 to be drawn against for equipment and maintenance. The newspaper to which the correspondent is accredited must give a bond of $200 for his good conduct in the field, which, in the event of infraction of any of the rules, shall be forfeited to any charity that the Secretary of War may name.

The correspondent must further take an oath of loyalty of the usual military form and agree to abide in letter and spirit by all the regulations laid down for his guidance. If at any time the number of correspondents becomes so large as to be an incumbrance, the Secretary of War will refuse other passes until such time as he deems expedient, when other applicants who fulfil the conditions will be received in the order of their applications. Not more than one correspondent will be received from any one publication or syndicate of publications or press association with the same field army. Men who have evidently secured credentials with a view to adventure rather than serious work as correspondents will not be received.

Their employers must show that they have been working members of their profession. In adition to the requirements for home correspondents, a foreign correspondent must have served in other campaigns, present credentials as to his character from high officers of the army to which he was attached, and accompanying the letter from his employers must present a letter from his ambassador in Washington personally vouching for him. An official photographer will accompany each field army. His films and plates will be sent promptly to Washington, where prints will be issued at a nominal cost to the press. No professional photographers and moving-picture men will be received.

Snails as Substitutes for Oysters.

(From The Indianapolis News.)

The American people are fond of oysters and clams, but they have never learned to eat snails. In some parts of the world snails are regarded as a great delicacy by persons who shudder at the thought of eating an oyster or a clam. In Paris at the height of the snail season the daily consumption is about fifty tons, or some 200,000,000 snails. The Journal of the American Medical Association believes that in neglecting the snail Americans are overlooking an opportunity to reduce the cost of living and at the same time to enjoy a delicacy about which there might be as much enthusiasm as about the oyster. A few are sold in this country, generally to foreigners, but, although American snails are as palatable as French snails, the demand in this country is so small that dealers are forced to import them from France. In Europe snail culture has become a very profitable business. Authorities who have investigated believe that in the Mississippi Valley snails could be raised "at practically no cost, either in money, time or labor." With a place to run where they are secure from attack and enough to eat, they multiply rapidly and can be grown in large numbers on a small area. It is stated that they furnish about the same yield of nutrients as oysters. Of course, to the average American who has not tasted edible snails as prepared by the French the idea of eating them is not likely to arouse pangs of hunger. But apparently all that is needed is a trial.

THE FIGHTING TURK

Neither a Splendid Warrior Nor Chivalrous, It Is Asserted.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In his brilliant review of the second year of the world war the inimitable Frank H. Simonds writes: "The Turk was making the finest fight in his splendid fighting history. . . ."

The Turkish troops who were so ingloriously defeated by the Balkan League have been represented during this war not only as splendid fighters, but "chivalrous." This is due partly to the efforts of an English school of Turcophile pamphleteers and journalists like Marmaduke Pickthall and Dixon-Johnson, who have always exhibited an abnormal predilection for Moslems, and partly to certain English politicians who, since the Gallipoli fiasco and the Kut-el-Amara "incident"—English euphemism for defeat—have essayed, by assiduously extolling the Turkish "chivalry," "clean fighting" and "bravery," both to remove the sting of these English reverses and to make the Germans appear inferior to the Turks. Even General Townshend was "deeply impressed by the unforgettable chivalry of the Turks."

How deeply the Turks appreciate these English encomiums lavished upon them can be judged from the following fulmination of the Turkish journal "Anadoloo," that, describing the British defeat at Kut-el-Amara, concludes boastfully: "Napoleon III often repeated that the Almighty had created the Italians that they might be beaten by the Austrians. To-morrow history will record that the craven English were created that they might be extirpated by the Turks."

The Turkish soldier cannot fight splendidly except when he is opposed to defenceless women and children. He won the fame of a good fighter in the battle of Plevna, but then he was temperate, devoutly religious and fanatic. However, since that time the Turkish soldier has become an inebriated, lascivious and diseased monster. Because the Turkish government encouraged its Moslem subjects to plunder, rape and slay the Christians under Ottoman domination, its army has degenerated into a licentious rabble of criminals, unavailingly whited by the late General von der Goltz and his compeers, as was proved by the Balkan campaign. The Turkish success at the Gallipoli Peninsula must be ascribed chiefly to the inadequate forces of the Allied powers and to the natural defences of the position, made impregnable by the German Krupps. In Mesopotamia the Turkish troops would present a very sorry figure but for the brave Arabs. A government of murderers, by murderers and for murderers, like that of Turkey, is incapable of producing brave troops. The fighting quality of the present day Turkish soldier is brilliantly demonstrated in his precipitous flight before the victorious armies of Grand Duke Nicholas.

As to the chivalry and clean fighting of the Turkish soldier, we may state that if torturing the Russian wounded in the Armenian theatre of war, grossly insulting the English and French women interned in Syria, maltreating and executing two French officers taken prisoners under the white flag at Kum-Kale, and fiendishly striving to exterminate the whole Armenian nation—incidents recorded by the British press—are symptoms of chivalry, then the Turks are entitled to that honor!

ARSHAG MAHDESIAN.

New York, July 31, 1916.

Holidays in the Public Schools.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: We are all tired of criticism of the public schools—also some of us are tired of the reasons for the criticism. For instance, all of us who have children in the schools know that during the school year there are many Jewish holidays, some of them of several days' duration. During those holidays the writer's son, who is a student in a boys' high school, comes home night after night with the information that as there were so few boys in school they only marked time. By actual count this happened ten times during last school year. Are our schools then sectarian? What would happen if any other religious body interfered with the routine of the schools?

The incongruous part is that the same boys who are not allowed to go to school spend their time on the streets and in many cases sell papers, etc. The writer infers that this custom has been adopted with the consent of the Board of Education, but would be glad to hear otherwise.

ANOTHER LONG SUFFERER.

New York, July 31, 1916.

Riley's Best Poem.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The President of the United States has said that he received "joyful pleasure" from the poems of James Whitcomb Riley. I am at a loss to determine what sort of pleasure joyless pleasure would be—unless, to be sure, it is that "melancholy pleasure" so frequently referred to by our popular novelists; but I dare say that Mr. Wilson was vaguely endeavoring to define the sentimental satisfaction which, as a recent editorial in your newspaper pointed out, thousands of city-bound readers derive from Mr. Riley's homely poems on subjects recalling their own rural boyhood. Doubtless, too, this was the satisfaction that Longfellow had in mind when he named the young Riley as a possibly great American poet. Oddly enough, however, Mr. Riley did not prefer the boyhood or dialect verses among his work. I remember talking to him once in Philadelphia, when he was sitting for the unworthy Sergeant portrait, and saying that I liked best his brief and beautiful "Bereaved." Riley's eyes brightened, "That is the best thing I ever did," said he.

REGINALD WRIGHT KAUFFMAN.

Columbia, Penn., July 28, 1916.

Sunday's Accident.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: You say in your editorial this morning: "Only prompt and thorough judicial action in this case can guarantee the community against a repetition of Sunday's accident."

There are very many people in this country who believe "prompt and thorough judicial action" in regard to the cases now in the courts pertaining to the breaches of neutrality on the part of German sympathizers would have prevented the occurrence of Sunday's tragedy.

It is possible that if the fall elections were over we would get more prompt and thorough action in the courts. Our ships and factries have been blown up, our docks burned, our people murdered, and no one has been brought to justice.

G. E. ST. JOHN.

New York, July 31, 1916.

The Witch Burning Myth.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: May I correct the statement in the letter of L. L. Forman published in to-day's issue of your paper?

As a Massachusetts woman and D. A. R. member, I protest that "witches" were never "burned" in the United States, "merrily, by the score," or any other way. During the wave of witchcraft that spread over Europe, when hundreds were killed, an echo of the trouble touched our shores, and twenty in all were hanged, not burned, in Massachusetts Bay Colony. Your correspondent's letter is timely and the mistake no doubt inadvertent.

MRS. E. W. HALE.

New York, July 31, 1916.

MICAWBER.

WORSE THAN THE BLACKLIST

The British Requirement That Embassy Shall Pass All Shipments.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I should like to call your attention to a practice which, as it affects all exporters, is more far-reaching than the blacklist, namely, the restrictions imposed on American commerce by reason of the refusal of steamship companies to accept shipments from American exporters unless each shipment is accompanied by a letter of assurance from the Trade Department of the British Embassy.

On July 24 you published a news article which pointed out some of the dangers of this practice, but the article did not show how serious the conditions are, and accordingly this letter is written to bring the whole situation before you and your readers.

The British Embassy, for the avowed purpose of serving the convenience of American shippers, announced that upon application it would look into each proposed shipment and in proper cases grant a so-called "letter of assurance" stating that there was no objection on the part of the British government to the proper consignment. The practice has so far engrafted itself upon the American export business that at the present time no steamship company will accept an export shipment from this country to the Scandinavian countries unless it is accompanied by such a letter.

This system instead of being a benefit has proved to be a menace. Exporters cannot tell in advance whether they will get a letter of assurance. They know that no steamship company will take the shipment without such a letter; they know that such a letter may be issued within a week, a month, two months, or may not be issued at all.

Apart from the fact that it is extremely humiliating for an American exporter to have to apply to the British government for permission to ship goods, the position of the American exporter is a very anxious one. He does not know what orders to give the manufacturers or what orders to take for shipments, for he cannot tell in advance whether a letter of assurance will be issued or not. Letters of assurance are delayed and sometimes refused though goods are on the embargo list of the Scandinavian countries. In articles with fluctuating markets—and many of the articles exported are such—the danger and inconvenience are greatly magnified.

Cases have been called to the attention of the writer where letters of assurance were issued ten weeks after application was made.

The situation has grown steadily worse. At first American exporters were invited to bear the cable expense of investigating the shipments under consideration; now they are required to bear such expense. Up to a few weeks ago one of the Scandinavian lines took shipments without requiring a letter of assurance, but relying upon a guarantee from the consignee. Even that practice has been discontinued. Now no shipment is taken unless accompanied by a letter of assurance.

Nor does it seem that the system is conducted even without discrimination. Thus we have it on the authority of the Anglo-Norwegian "Trade Journal," published in London, that the British government would consider applications for the granting of general licenses to British exporters to export cotton piece goods and other manufactures of cotton to Norway—such licenses to last for three months. No such general license is available in this country.

The practice of issuing letters of assurance, as it has worked out, enables the British government to place a real embargo upon any class of American merchandise destined for the Scandinavian countries by refusing to issue letters of assurance covering shipments of that class of merchandise. In this way the English export trade can readily be fostered at the expense of the American export trade.

If the American exporter can get his goods upon the water, it may be that they may be subject to search, seizure and delay, though it is questionable how far the English prize courts will sustain the government in certain practices now believed to be unlawful. But if they are seized the exporter has remedies more or less effectual if the seizure is unlawful. Moreover, diplomatic negotiations may eventually be able to effect a clear and fair understanding upon the question of seizure.

But if the exporter cannot get his goods upon the ocean because the companies refuse to take them without letters of assurance he is without any remedy. He simply cannot trade with the Scandinavian countries without the consent of England. Exporters have not been in a position to protest openly against this practice, undoubtedly because it was feared that letters of assurance might be withheld by England from those protesting against the practice. In the meantime the situation has become worse and worse.

It has been suggested that the immediate remedy is to compel steamship companies doing business with this country to receive goods for shipment regardless of whether or not the shipment is approved or disapproved by a foreign country, and to penalize them if they discriminate against goods which have not such approval. This remedy would at least result in getting American goods upon the water and then, if there were unlawful seizures, there would be recourse to diplomatic relations and to the prize courts. But whatever the remedy, the situation is dangerous to business and humiliating to the dignity of this country, and this blockade of American ports should be promptly and effectually destroyed.

LEX.

New York, July 26, 1916.

Syracuse and After.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Your news article of to-day under the heading: "Hughes Leaders Count on Moose Support," is amusing reading for one who knows the facts which this article does not contain.

The Perkins crowd at the Syracuse meeting of the state committee did not have the votes to put across the Hughes indorsement and haven't got them now, and have not since asked all the state committeemen and county chairmen for their views as representatives of the party.

Mr. Hotchkiss and the Perkins lackeys, Chairman Johnson and Secretary Gerdes, ascertained the sentiment of the state committee at Syracuse, which should be quite convincing and authoritative to Mr. Perkins without any further canvass.

The absolute failure of would-be "Boss" Perkins to hoodwink the state committee has prompted the headquarters crowd to attempt to manufacture Hughes sentiment through state chairmen, whose expenses for trips to meetings in New York have been paid by Mr. Perkins, and who might as a consequence feel under obligation to reply to the Perkins telegrams in a manner calculated to flatter the vanity of the donor of "expenses."

WENDELL P. MURRAY,
An Unbossed Member of the Progressive State Committee and a Chicago Delegate.

New York, July 31, 1916.

No.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Yesterday's issue of The Tribune contained an article entitled "British Domestic Crisis," which dealt largely with the Irish Home Rule question. Does The Tribune favor the handing over by England the lives, fortunes and happiness of the much hated Protestant minority of Ireland to the keeping and mercy of the men who have recently taken the advantage of a great war to shoot down innocent men, women and even children in the streets of Dublin for no other cause than that they were true and loyal to their home government? Omitting what these agitators have accomplished by the use of the knife, torch and bludgeon, do their past or present actions recommend them as safe and sane guardians of the people of Ulster, or as a people eminently qualified to govern themselves? When considering their main source of support and inspiration, the political knaves and agitators of our own country, who lately in convention at Boston congratulated the German alliance on their great victory and on Germany being the defender of small nations, can there be any confidence in their fairness or ability?

JOHN B. STANNARD.

Springfield, Mass., July 27, 1916.

THE PROGRESSIVE'S DUTY

It Is to Fight Shy of Mr. Hughes and the Old Guard.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I note with extreme interest the letter of F. W. Seward, jr., in Friday's Tribune. I am afraid that Mr. Seward misses the mark. He conceives of Mr. Hughes as an absolutely innocent man with regard to the late Republican shambles—I mean convention. Consider the matter: Mr. Hughes knew of the possibility of his nomination. Secure in the seclusion of the Supreme Court's hallowed precincts, he never sought to speak out in favor of the one American, Theodore Roosevelt. With silence, born of prudence, not of a sense of the proprieties, he awaited, pen in hand, until the "old crowd" said "kill," and while they tore Progressivism limb from limb, he wrote his acceptance of a nomination flecked with the blood of a betrayed Progressivism!

A word from Mr. Hughes would have insured the nomination of Roosevelt. Selfish interest bade him hold from speech. Therefore, with Mr. Hughes's aid, the "old crowd" simply "put one over" on the Progressives and T. R. They spread the word around that Penrose, boss of bosses, looked with favor on the Colonel. The Progressives marked time to give the Republicans a chance to nominate T. R., as they thought. Penrose's ruse worked!

I would ask Mr. Seward to ponder: What happened between the ending of the second ballot and the beginning of the third? I fear that if that question were fully answered Charles Evans Hughes's part would not be a very creditable one!

The awful story of the third ballot showed that assurances of acceptance must have been received from Mr. Hughes! Upon the casting of that ballot, as we all know, the Progressives named Roosevelt. Beaten by the "same old crowd," facing a forlorn hope, T. R. had to refuse. To save his face he must support Mr. Hughes. With the rank and file this is not so. The reactionaries have said, "The people be d——!" They seek to show that the people do not rule. Should they elect Hughes and Fairbanks they will prove it! I am an enrolled Republican, but not a benighted one. Mr. Seward and the rest, the bosses have slapped us in the face. We must prove to them that we are men, not partisans! Swallow our dislike of a few incomprehensible Democratic policies.

In view of the facts, it behooves us to fight shy of Mr. Hughes. It will be interesting to note during the campaign that he will never recognize the existence of a Progressive party. Whenever he speaks he always refers to "the reunited (Republican) party." The forces of reaction are with him, while progressive forces stand aloof. Examination of the questions involved will produce ample evidence to show that a Hughes victory and a popular, progressive victory cannot synchronize.

DEE ESS.

New York, July 29, 1916.

Coney Island in 1861.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Your article on Coney Island in last Sunday's issue of The Tribune was more than interesting to me. It recalled to my mind a Sunday trip we made there in the early 60s, perhaps 1861, or fifty-five years ago, when I was a lad of seven. We took the Smith Street car, I suppose, but there was some defect in the gear some way, and about every twenty minutes or so we would run off the track. It was along a wide country road with farms on each side. I remember that the picket fences were used as levers to lift the car to the tracks.

Finally, at the last stretch, everything seemed to go well. The car was not only overcrowded inside, but people were sitting on the roof exactly as in your pleasure-giving illustration. Our horses ran speedily, so speedily, in fact, that when we came to the end of the rails the driver could not stop the car, and it ran off into the sand and stopped with such suddenness that not only were we insiders badly shaken up, but the outsiders flew off the roof with great velocity.

But we had got to Coney, and that was the main point. I remember seeing one hotel there and a quantity of wash hanging on the lines, and I remember, too, that when we ordered asparagus they told us they had no "sparrowgrass." I wonder is there any other Tribune reader who may remember this particular trip?

F. G. BRILL.

Deland, Fla., July 26, 1916.